

Date: Mon, 12 Sep 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #438
To: Ham-Policy

Today's Topics:

Instant Callsigns Status of "vanity" callsign proposal?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 10 Sep 1994 21:45:18 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Instant Callsigns
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Brown (danb@acme.csusb.edu) wrote:
: Let's see if anyone here cares about anything other than code testing...

: I'd like to see a system implemented where new hams would receive
: their callsigns immediately (or at least very quickly). Suggestions:

The ARRL proposed something similar to this a number of months ago, and it quickly went "thud" with the alluring prospect of electronic filing, which would speed things up tremendously - to about 2 or 3 weeks.

My own pet idea for implementing this is to issue a temporary *operator's* permit, and make people find sponsors to allow them to use their station licenses - like AB10M/jnh, if Joe New Ham goes to AB1 Old Man to sponsor him. The advantages are easy implementation - simply declare CSCE's indicating new license to be operator permits -

plus anyone who wants to get on the air is going to get a thorough personal grilling from the sponsor about operating practice. (Of course, it's legal now for one operator to use another's station license.) Bingo! Instant operating authority.

-drt

|David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com|

Date: Sat, 10 Sep 1994 21:48:23 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Status of "vanity" callsign proposal?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Doug Mauldin (gdmauldin@ualr.edu) wrote:

: Can someone confirm or deny the rumor I heard within the past few days
: that the FCC has finally gone ahead with a plan to honor requests for
: specific callsigns ("vanity" callsigns, in yuppie-speak)?

Last I heard, after reviewing the comments they were going to try to implement a one-time \$150 fee for a vanity call, which makes more sense anyway. Doing this requires Congressional action, since the only thing authorized now is \$7/year. So we wait.

-drt

|David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com|

Date: Sun, 11 Sep 94 16:51:39 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <34qa56\$d86@crcnis1.unl.edu>, <34qihs\$9b7@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <34rbf6\$jun@crcnis1.unl.edu>p
Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an

gregory brown <gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu> writes:

>What is it about some Americans that leads them to believe that the
>rest of the world has all the resources and opportunities we have?

What is it about some other Americans that leads them to believe that the rest of the world does not?

The fact is that many other countries have a growing middle class -- even countries like Mexico or India, not to mention Taiwan or Singapore.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #438
